DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 255 279 JC 850 151

AUTHOR Robinson, Isaac A.; Shearon, Ronald W.
TITLE The Significance of Race and Selected Socioeconomic and Academic Variables in Program Tracking among Curriculum Students in the North Carolina Community College System.
PUB DATE 8 Apr 83
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Sociological Society (45th, Atlanta, GA, April 8, 1983).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Black Students; Community Colleges; Females; Males; Minority Groups; State Surveys; *Student Characteristics; Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students
IDENTIFIERS *North Carolina

ABSTRACT

In spring 1979, a study was conducted to identify differences in the type of program track enrolled in by students in the North Carolina Community College System according to selected ascriptive variables (i.e., race, sex, occupation of household head, parents' income, and father's occupation); achievement variables (i.e., high school grade point average (GPA) and rank, and General Educational Development (GED) scores). Data for the study were taken from a larger study of North Carolina community college students, focusing on 11,120 curriculum students enrolled in college transfer, technical, and vocational programs. Study findings included the following: (1) 7% of the black students were enrolled in the college-transfer track, 64% in the technical programs, and 29% in the vocational program track; (2) among white students, 15% were in the college-transfer track, 64% in the technical track, and 20% in the vocational program track; (3) 13% of the males and 14% of the females were enrolled in the college-transfer track; (4) students with low socioeconomic characteristics were clustered in the vocational and technical program tracks; (5) twice as many white students as black students were enrolled in the college-transfer track; (6) there did not appear to be major differences among students in the college-transfer, technical and vocational tracks according to achievement variables, with one exception, i.e., a higher proportion of students in the college-transfer track were in the upper one-third of their high school class, whereas a higher proportion of the vocational students were in the lower one-third of their high school class or did not graduate from high school. (LAL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED255279

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF RACE AND SELECTED SOCIOECONOMIC AND ACADEMIC VARIABLES IN PROGRAM TRACKING AMONG CURRICULUM STUDENTS IN THE NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

Presented to

The 45th Annual Meeting
of the
Southern Sociological Society

Atlanta, Georgia
April 8, 1983

by

Isaac A. Robinson*
Ronald W. Shearon

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ISAAC ROBINSON

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

JC 850151

*About the authors: Isaac A. Robinson is an Associate Professor of Sociology at North Carolina Central University, Durham, North Carolina. Ronald W. Shearon is Professor and Associate Head, Department of Adult and Community College Education, North Carolina State University at Raleigh.

INTRODUCTION

In The Declining Significance of Race, Wilson (1978) focused attention on race as an ascriptive factor determining access to the American opportunity structure (Willie, 1978). After tracing the historical changes in the nature of race relations in the United States, Wilson concluded that since the civil rights era the ascriptive factor of race is being replaced by socioeconomic factors as major determinants of social mobility among the black population. Within this broad context, there currently is much discussion about the effects of ascriptive and achievement factors on the outcomes of the educational institution for blacks (Medsker and Trent, 1965; Sewell and Shah, 1967; Bowles and DeCosta, 1971; Cross, 1971). Of particular concern is the steady increase in the number of black and low SES students attending two-year colleges throughout the United States. Goodhold (1976, p. 29) observed:

> The most recent enrollment data indicate that the majority of first-time entering black freshmen are going to community colleges. The trend of four-year institutions again appears to be away from egalitarianism and toward meritocracy in consideration of the poor, blacks, and other minorities.

Other authors attribute the increasing number of black students attending two-year institutions to such factors as low tuition and fees, the absence of a tradition of legal segregation, and the diversity of programs to meet the unique needs of these students (Thornton, 1960; Besse, 1964; Winkler, 1975).

Given these trends, the two-year college has become a major focus of recent research efforts.

CURRENT ISSUES

Currently, there seems to be a polarity in concepts of the broad function of the community college in the American educational system. One major conceptual frame of reference holds that the community college is a primary force in providing for an open system of higher education based on egalitarianism (Monroe, 1972; Gedhold, 1976; Vaughan, 1979; Gleazer, 1980). Another view holds that the community college has as its latent function the perpetuation of class-based tracking among institutions of higher education and within community colleges themselves (Karabel, 1972; Zwerling, 1976; Pincus, 1980).

Proponents of the community college movement argue that the egalitarian philosophy and open-door policy of these institutions have effectively challenged the traditional elitist orientation of the U.S. system of higher education (Bushnell and Zagaris, 1972). This challenge is purported to have resulted in increased ability of the system to adopt to a changing economic environment in which there is an increased demand for a technically trained work force (Blocker et al., 1965; Carnegie Commission, 1970). This growth is especially pronounced in data-processing and semiprofessional, health-related occupations that require more than a high school education but less than a four-year degree. In addition to

providing technical workers for a changing economic system, proponents of community colleges further claim that these institutions have relieved four-year colleges/universities of the responsibility for dealing with students from a noncollege-preparatory high school curriculum. Society is thus insulated from the political danger of having an excess of college graduates (Carnegie Commission, 1973; Freeman, 1976).

The polar view argues that, even though these community colleges generally are viewed as 'the leading edge of an open and egalitarian system of higher education (Karabel, 1972, p. 526), they are, in reality, "contemporary expressions of the dual historical pattern of class-based tracking and of educational inflation." Community colleges are depicted as being on the bottom track of the higher education system, as evidenced by the class origins and occupational destinations of its students (Pincus, 1980).

Recent studies document the racial and lower-class backgrounds of community college students (Clark, 1960; Tillery, 1966; Bayer and Boruch, 1969; Knoell, 1970; Weinbach, 1974). From their comparisons of the father's occupation classification and type of college entered, Medsker and Trent (1965) concluded that community colleges enroll mostly children of blue-collar workers, while the more prestigious public and private colleges/universities enroll mostly children of professionals and managers.

Examination of the socioeconomic characteristics of students from the local area who were attending Stanford University, the University of California, San Jose State College, and San Jose Junior College disclosed wide variations between the four institutions (Clark, 1960). At Stanford, nearly 90% of the local student body were from families of professional men, business owners, and business officials; only about 13% were from lower status white-collar and blue-collar homes. The reverse was true for San Jose Junior College in that 77% of the local students were from lower status white-collar and blue-collar homes.

Evidence exists of tracking within community colleges, based on socioeconomic factors. Clark (1960, p. 71) refers to this process as "the cooling-out of students with unrealistic aspirations." That is, low socioeconomic students are counseled away from college-transfer programs toward vocational programs that lead to minimum future occupational mobility. Cross (1970) documented the class-based composition of community college students enrolled in low-prestige vocational programs. Compared to families of students in the more prestigious college-transfer programs, families of vocational students tended to have a markedly lower family income, lower father's educational and occupational levels, and occupied minority group status. Cross found further that over one-half of students in the college-transfer curriculum were from white-collar families compared to less than one-fourth of students in the vocational programs.

Given the foregoing discussion, the primary sociological issue is whether or not the purported tracking between educational institutions (and specifically within community colleges) is reflected in students' subsequent occupational choices.

CONCEPTUAL FRAME OF REFERENCE

The polar views about the outcomes of community college attendance for individuals and society tend to reflect the classical structural-functional and conflict approaches to institutional behavior and social stratification. The structural-functional perspective is based primarily on the writings of French sociologist Emile Durkheim (1964/1893). The functionalist approach, as proposed by Durkheim, focuses on the influence of "social facts" on the behavior of members of society and the consequences of these facts for the maintenance of social cohesion. Durkheim (1956/1922) viewed the institution of education as an important social fact essential to the cohesion and survival of society. Durkheim (1956, p. 71) maintained that:

> Education is the influence exercised by the adult generation on those that are not yet ready for social life. Its object is to arouse and to develop in the child a certain number of physical, intellectual, and moral states which are demanded of him by both the political society as a whole and the special milieu for which he is specifically destined.

Thus, Durkheim's view of the educational institution is the "methodical" socialization of the younger generation.

Modern sociologists, particularly Parson (1959) and Davis and Moore (1945), extended the functional view of stratification and the educational institution. Parson (1959) views the school and the context of the classroom as having structural characteristics through which young people develop sets of norms or principles of conduct required of them in later adult life. Parson also focuses on the screening function of the school, based on ability, achievement, and universalistic norms. Parson (1959, p. 300) thus concludes:

> . . . the main process of differentiation (which forms another point of view in selection) that occurs during elementary school takes place on a single main axis of achievement. Broadly, moreover, the differentiation leads up through high school to a bifurcation into college-goers and noncollege-goers.

The conflict perspective is based essentially on the writings of Karl Marx. According to Laski (1967), Marx viewed social stratification as neither inevitable nor necessary for society. Rather, he believed that stratification (social classes) reflects the power and dominance of the bourgeoise or ownership class over the proletariat or masses. Thus, the prevailing social arrangements and values of industrial societies reflect the values and vested interests of this ownership class (Marx, 1967/1867).

More recent writers who have adopted the conflict perspective suggest that, contrary to prevailing beliefs, the U.S. educational system functions to preserve the existing

class structure (Bowles and Gintis, 1976). In so doing, education serves the need of the capitalistic structure to socialize people into accepting the legitimacy of existing social and economic inequalities. The essential function of education, then (Bowles and Gintis, 1976, p. 193), is the preparation of children of the working class for factory work, "specifically, in its emphasis on disciplines, punctuality, acceptance of authority outside the family, and and individual accountability for one's work."

No one theoretical perspective is tested in this paper. Aspects of both the functional and the conflict perspectives are utilized in understanding the outcomes of attending the community college. This understanding is intended both for the individual and the society.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Based on the foregoing theoretical perspective and the literature reviewed, specific research questions were formulated as a guide to this study.

> RESEARCH QUESTION 1: Are there differences in the type of program track enrolled in by students in the North Carolina Community College System according to selected ascriptive variables (race, sex, occupation of household head, parents' income, and father's education)?

> RESEARCH QUESTION 2: Are there differences in the type of educational program track enrolled in by students in the North Carolina Community College System according to selected achievement variables (student's high school grade-point average, student's high school rank, and student's GED score)?

RESEARCH QUESTION 3: Do the selected ascriptive or achievement variables explain the variation in student enrollment in the educational program track of the North Carolina Community College System?

METHODOLOGY

The data for this study were taken from a larger study of students enrolled in the North Carolina Community College System during the spring quarter, 1979 (Shearon et al., 1980). Shearon et al. used a cross-sectional survey research design in their study. The sample design utilized a two-stage, stratified format. The first stage involved the construction of a sample frame based on a stratified systematic cluster sample design representing two subpopulations, students enrolled in the curriculum program area and student enrolled in the continuing education area in each of the 57 institutions. The second stage of the sample design involved the selection of intact, individual classes in the two program areas, whose students formed the study population. The population from which their sample was drawn included 19,829 curriculum and continuing education students enrolled in each of the 57 institutions. Students responded to a 48-item machine-scorable survey instrument. The resulting 16,408 usable instruments represented an 82% mean return rate for all 57 institutions.

The subsample that served as a basis for this study is the 11,120 curriculum student respondents to the larger study who were enrolled in the college-transfer, technical, and vocational programs.

Significant variations between the three program tracks, in terms of selected ascriptive and achievement variables, were determined by analysis of variance. The amount of variation in the dependent variable (program track) explained by the selected ascriptive and achievement variables was determined by stepwise regression.

The independent variables selected for study were those ascriptive and achievement variables, gleaned from the literature on education and stratification, that are widely held as having significant effects (Coleman, 1966; Jenks, 1972).

VARIABLE MEASUREMENT

One dependent variable (program track) and two categories of independent variables, ascriptive variables and achievement variables, were used in this study.

Dependent Variable

Program track, the dependent variable, consists of the specific educational programs in the college-transfer, technical, and vocational program areas. These programs form an educational hierarchy when the specific educational curriculum is matched with the type of occupation for which the student is being prepared.

Independent Variables

No index of socioeconomic variables was developed for this study. Students' education, parents' education, students' income, parents' income, and fathers' occupational status were

utilized as separate measures of socioeconomic status. As mentioned, the independent variables were in two categories, ascriptive and achievement variables.

Ascriptive variables utilized in the study were age, race, and sex. Age was the students' actual age as of their last birthday. A dummy variable was used for race, with black coded as 0 and white coded as 1. A dummy variable was used for sex, with female coded as 0 and male coded as 1.

Achievement variables utilized in the study were high school grade-point average, high school rank, and GED score. High school grade-point average (GPA) is a measure of the students' self-reported high school GPA, where A = 90-100; B = 80-89; C = 70-79; and below C = below 70. High school rank is a measure of the students' self-report of high school rank; upper one-third, middle one-third, lower one-third, and did not attend high school. GED score is a measure of the students' self-report of scores on the Tests of General Educational Development.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The sample population of this study was 11,120 students enrolled in the college-transfer, technical, and vocational curriculum programs in the North Carolina Community College System. Distributions of these students by selected ascriptive variables (Table 1) indicate that 7% of the black students were enrolled in the college-transfer, 64% in the technical,

and 29% in the vocational program track. Among the white students, 15% were enrolled in the college transfer track, 64% in the technical, and 20% in the vocational program track.

Table 1. Percentage distribution of college-transfer, technical, and vocational students, by ascriptive variables

Ascriptive variable	Educational program track			Total	F-value
	College-transfer	Technical	Vocational		
Race:					15.5*
Black	7	64	29	100	
White	15	64	20	100	
Sex:					41.3*
Male	13	57	30	100	
Female	14	71	15	100	
Occupation head-of-household:					36.6*
White-collar	41	26	18		
Blue-collar	45	50	56		
Unskilled & farm	14	24	26		
Total	100	100	100		
Parents' income:					8.1*
Less than $8,000	22	33	44		
$8,000-14,999	25	29	27		
$15,000-24,999	29	21	14		
$25,000 or more	21	13	9		
Parents not living	3	4	6		
Total	100	100	100		
Father's education:					2.5
Less than high school	35	52	60		
High school graduate	32	28	24		
Some college	15	9	7		
College graduate	18	11	9		
Total	100	100	100		

*Significant at .01 level.

The data further show that 13% of the male students were enrolled in the college-transfer track as compared to 57% in the technical and 30% in the vocational track. Among females, 14% were enrolled in the college-transfer track, 71% in the technical, and 15% in the vocational track. Given the large size of the sample, the F statistic was significant even though the proportion of black students enrolled in each of the curriculum tracks was similar to the proportion of white students enrolled in similar tracks. The exception to this observation was in the college-transfer track, wherein 7% of the blacks vs. 15% of the whites were enrolled. The larger proportion of females (71%) were enrolled in technical programs; the reverse was true for the vocational programs.

The heads-of-household of 41% of students in the college-transfer track were in the white category as compared to 26% in the technical track and 18% in the vocational track. The heads-of-household of only 14% of the students in the college-transfer track were in the unskilled occupational category as compared to 26% in the vocational track. This trend toward lower socioeconomic status for the vocational track also was evident when parents' income was considered. Only 22% of the parents of students in the college-transfer track had annual incomes of less than $8,000 as compared to 44% in the vocational track. Similarly, the fathers of 60% of the students in the vocational track had less than a high school education as compared to only 35% in the college-transfer

track. The F statistic was significant beyond the .05 level for all the ascriptive variables except father's education.

These findings tend to answer Research Question 1 in the affirmative; students in the college-transfer, technical, and vocational tracks differ according to ascriptive variables. The evidence indicates a clustering of students with low socioeconomic characteristics in the vocational and technical program tracks. Also, twice as many white students than black students were enrolled in the college-transfer track.

Data on the achievement variables are presented in Table 2. Among the three program tracks, a majority of the students indicated that their high school GPA was between 80 and 89 or "B". Similar proportions of the students in the three tracks reported a high school GPA of "C" or below. Large differences, however, were evident between students in the three program tracks who had high school GPAs between 90 and 100 or "A"; 18 percent of college-transfer students reported a GPA of "A", while only 8% of the vocational students fell within that grade level. The data also indicate that technical students scored lower on the GED tests than was the case for vocational or college-transfer students. Likewise, 37% of students in the college-transfer track were in the upper one-third of their high school class as compared to 31 percent in the technical and 20 percent in the vocational track. The F statistic was significant beyond the .05 level for high school rank but not for high school GPA and GED scores.

Table 2. Percentage distribution of college-transfer, technical, and vocational students, by achievement variables.

Achievement variable	Educational program track			F-value
	College-transfer	Technical	Vocational	
High school GPA:				1.3
A (90-100)	18	16	8	
B (80-89)	55	56	51	
C (70-79)	25	26	35	
Below C	1	1	3	
Did not attend HS	1	1	3	
Total	100	100	100	
High school rank:				36.1*
Upper one-third	37	31	20	
Middle one-third	52	53	51	
Lower one-third	5	6	8	
Did not graduate	6	10	21	
Total	100	100	100	
GED score:				1.5
Below 225	21	59	31	
225-274	65	35	63	
275 or above	14	6	6	
Total	100	100	100	

*Significant at .0001 level.

The findings pertaining to achievement variables tend to answer Research Question 2 in the negative, with one exception. There does not appear to be major differences between students in the college-transfer, technical, and vocational tracks according to achievement variables. The one exception indicates that a higher proportion of students in the college-transfer track were in the upper one-third of their high school class, whereas a higher proportion of the vocational students were in the lower one-third of their high school class or did not graduate from high school.

Correlation coefficients calculated for the ascriptive and achievement variables included in the model for this research are presented in Table 3. All of the variables show very weak to moderate correlations with each other. The strongest correlations between the independent variables are between high school rank and high school GPA (r=.612), between high school GPA and student's education (r=.419), and between high school rank and student's education (r=.450). These relatively strong correlations were expected, because these variables tend to measure the same ability attribute.

Very weak correlations are found between the independent variables and the dependent variable, program track (Table 3). The strongest correlation is between program track and student's education (r=.203). The ascriptive variables (age, sex, race, parents' income, and father's education) show very weak correlations with the dependent variable, program track. Among the ascriptive variables, the strongest correlation is between father's education and program track (r=.143). Among the achievement variables, the strongest correlation is between student's education and program track (r=.203).

Standardized B coefficients for the independent variables, based on the stepwise regression procedure, appear in Table 4. The B coefficients indicate very little explained variation in the dependent variable, based on the

Table 3. Correlation matrix of variables used in the model

	STUED	FATED	GEDSC	HSAVE	HSRAN	SINC	PINC	OCCU	AGE	SEX	RACE	TRACK
STUED	1.000											
FATED	.309	1.000										
GEDSC	-.032	-.087	1.000									
HSAVE	.419	.203	.110	1.000								
HSRAN	.450	.237	.262	.612	1.000							
SINC	.189	-.082	.016	.112	-.068	1.000						
PINC	.086	.282	-.092	.045	-.089	.082	1.000					
OCCU	.248	-.275	.057	.148	.161	.133	.211	1.000				
AGE	-.162	-.262	.010	-.215	.199	.266	.195	-.044	1.000			
SEX	-.024	-.036	.088	-.156	-.105	.114	.001	-.021	.099	1.000		
RACE	.181	.234	.065	-.163	-.144	.211	.319	-.244	.042	.032	1.000	
TRACK	.203	.143	.094	-.127	-.181	.066	.139	-.139	.130	.132	.124	1.000

model. All of the independent variables in the model explain less than 35% of the variation in the dependent variable. These data indicate that the standard ascriptive and achievement variables explain little of the variation in student enrollment in the program tracks within the North Carolina Community College System. Thus, Research Question 3 must be answered in the negative.

Table 4. Stepwise regression showing standardized B for variables used in the model

Independent variable	Dependent variable (program track) B
STUED	.06032
FATED	.00550
GEDSC	a
HSAVE	a
HSRAN	-.06675
SINC	-.00743
PINC	.00932
OCCU	-.02431
AGE	-.00545
SEX	.07950
RACE	.08050

[a]Variable not strong enough to enter into the stepwise regression analysis.

CONCLUSIONS

The data presented in this study indicate that the standard ascriptive and achievement variables identified in the literature do not explain why students are enrolled in the various program tracks within the North Carolina Community College System. Even though significant variations exist between students enrolled in the college-transfer,

technical, and vocational program tracks, the ascriptive and achievement variables used in the regression model explain a negligible amount of the variation.

One possible explanation for these negative findings is that assigning high, medium, and low status to the college-transfer, technical, and vocational program tracks results in the loss of much of the status variation between the tracks. West and Shearon (1983) addressed this problem by using the specific program of study within the program track and a corresponding occupational score as the unit of analysis. This procedure controls for the possibility of overlapping program statuses between the three curriculum program tracks. The assumption is not made that all college-transfer programs prepare students for higher-status occupations than do technical or vocational programs.

An alternate hypothesis is that the North Carolina Community College System is atypical of similar systems described in the literature. That is, the System provides equal access to program tracks that is independent of the influence of background variables. Further research utilizing the technique developed by West and Shearon might result in different findings.

REFERENCES

Bayer, A., and R. Boruch. 1969. The Black Student in American Colleges. ACE Research Report 4(2). American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.

Besse, R. M. 1964. Education and the race problem. Jr. Commun. Coll. J. 39:36-41.

Blocker, C. E., R. F. Plumber, and R. C. Richardson. 1965. The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Bowles, F., and F. A. DeCosta. 1971. Between Two Worlds. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York.

Bushnell, D. S., and I. Sagaris. 1972. Report From Project Focus: Strategies for Change. American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. 1970. The Open-Door College. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. 1973. Priorities for Action: Final Report. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York.

Clark, B. R. 1960. The Open-Door College: A Case Study. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York.

Cross, K. P. 1970. The role of the junior college in providing postsecondary education for all. In Trends in Postsecondary Education. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Cross, K. P. 1971. Beyond the Open Door: New Student to Higher Education. Jossey-Bass, Inc., San Francisco.

Durkheim, E. 1956/1922. Education and Sociology. Translated by S. D. Fox. The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois.

Durkheim, E. 1964/1893. The Division of Labor in Society. Translated by G. Simpson. The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois.

Durkheim, E. 1973/1925. Moral Education. Translated by E. K. Wilson and H. Schnurer. The Free Press, New York.

Freeman, R. B. 1976. The Overeducated American. Academic Press, New York.

Gleazer, E. D. 1976. Resolution by blacks. Commun. Jr. Coll. J. 47(2):5-6.

Godheld, D. H. 1976. Most valuable medium for blacks. Commun. Jr. Coll. J. 47:28-31.

Karabel, J. 1972. Community colleges and social stratification. Harvard Educ. Rev. 42:512-562.

Medsker, L. L., and D. M. Tillery. 1970. People Who Need College! A Report on Students We Have Yet to Serve. American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.

Laski, H. 1967. The Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engles. Seabury Press, New York.

Marx, K. 1967. Das Capital. Originally published 1867. International Publishers, New York.

Medsker, L. L., and S. W. Trent. 1965. Factors Affecting College Attendance of High School Graduates From Varying Socioeconomic and Ability Levels. USOE Cooperative Research Project No. 438. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California at Berkeley.

Monroe, C. R. 1972. Profile of the Community College. Jossey-Bass, Inc., San Francisco.

Pincus, F. L. 1980. The false promise of community colleges: Class conflict and vocational education. Harvard Educ. Rev. 50(3):332-361.

Parson, T. 1959. The social class as a social system: Some of its functions in American society. Harvard Educ. Rev. 20(9):291-318.

Sewell, W. H., and V. P. Shah. 1967. Socioeconomc status, intelligence, and the attainment of higher education. Sociol. Educ. 40(1):1-23.

Shearon, R. W., R. G. Templin, Jr., D. E. Daniel, L. McG. Hoffman, and R. F. West. 1980. Putting Learning to Work: A Profile of Students in North Carolina Community Colleges, Technical Institutes, and Technical Colleges: A Technical Report. Occupational Education Research Services, North Carolina Department of Community Colleges, Raleigh.

Thornton, J. W. 1960. Who are students in junior colleges? Jr. Coll. J. 29:90-116.

Tillery, D., D. Donovan, and B. Sherman. 1966. SCOPE: Four-State Profiles, Grades Twelve, 1966, California, Illinois, Massachusetts, North Carolina. The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education and the College Entrance Examination Board, New York.

Weinbach, L. S. 1974. A Profile of Forest Park Community College Students, Fall, 1974. Educational Resource Information Center, Washington, D.C. ED-116 761.

West, R. F., and R. W. Shearon. 1982. Differences between black and white students in curriculum program status. Commun. Jr. Coll. Quart. 6:239-251.

Willie, C. V. 1978. The inclining significance of race. Society 1:7-9.

Wilson, W. J. 1978. The Declining Significance of Race. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Winkler, K. S. 1975. Black youth's share of enrollments' growth. Chron. Higher Educ. 2:10.

Zwerling, L. S. 1976. Second Best: The Crisis of the Community College. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
8118 Math-Sciences Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

MAY 24 1985